

## REMARKS

In summary, claims 1-56 are pending. Claims 14 and 30 are objected to. Claims 16, 18-32, and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Claims 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-21, 23-30, and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Claims 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, and 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections and objections. By this response the specification is herein amended. Claims 1, 3, 14, 16, 19-33, 44, and 49-56 are amended. Claims 2 and 18 are canceled. No new matter is added.

### Telephone Conversation With Examiner

Applicant thanks Examiner Recek for the telephone conversation conducted on November 28, 2007. Applicant's representative explained that a non-patent reference used to support claim rejections was not provided with the instant Office Action. Examiner Recek promptly faxed the reference to Applicant's representative. Applicant's representative and Examiner Recek briefly discussed some of the claim rejections and possible claim amendments. No conclusions were reached.

### Amendment To Specification

Paragraph [0001] of the specification is amended to include an application serial number of a related application and to expressly incorporate a provisional application by reference.

### Claim Objections

Claims 14 and 30 are objected to. Claims 14 is object to because it depends from a dependent claim and is separated by claims which do not also depend from said dependent claim. Claim 14 is amended to dependent upon an independent claim. Claim 30 is objected to because of a typographical error. Claim 30 is amended to correct the typographical error. Accordingly, it is requested that the objection to claims 14 and 30 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 101**

Claims 16, 18-32, and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter because, as asserted in the instant Office Action, the term “computer readable medium” can be construed as a signal. Without prejudice or disclaimer as to the whether claims 16, 18-32, and 49-56 are directed to non-statutory subject matter, claims 19-32 and 49-56 are amended to recite a “computer readable storage medium”, and claim 18 is canceled. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 16, 19-32, and 49-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 19-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because, as asserted in the instant Office Action, the phrase “at least one” raises a question as to the scope of the claims. Without prejudice or disclaimer as to the scope of claims 19-32, claims 19-32 are amended to recite “A” rather than “At least one”. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 19-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2, 4-6, 10, 13, 16-21, 23-30, and 49-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,943,752, issued to Masumoto *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Masumoto”).

Masumoto neither discloses nor suggests Applicant’s claimed invention. For example, in contrast to Applicant’s claimed invention, Masumoto teaches only a single display device. Additionally, Masumoto neither discloses nor suggests “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol” between devices as recited in amended independent claims 1, 19, 33, 44, and 49.

Masumoto teaches a presentation system comprising a single display device. “The present invention provides a presentation system, a display device, and a program ...”

(Emphasis added) (Abstract). “The present system … is structured … by connecting a PC 100 and a projector 200 via a LAN 50.” (Emphasis added) (Abstract). Only a single display device is shown in the figures of Masumoto (See Figures 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 11, 13, 17, 20, and 23). The objective of Masumoto is to provide “a smoother presentation performance in case where information a presenter wishes to refer to is displayed in a terminal but not in a displays device.” (Abstract, Column 3, lines 15-17). Masumoto neither discloses, nor even contemplates, managing multiple display devices.

Because Masumoto is not concerned with managing multiple display devices, Masumoto is not concerned with competition on the interface (e.g., LAN) between multiple display devices. Thus, Masumoto is not concerned with establishing a remote session for each display device. Nor is Masumoto concerned with establishing a remote session for each display device via a remoting protocol. Thus, not surprisingly, Masumoto nowhere teaches establishing a remote session via a remoting protocol between devices.

In the instant Office Action, it is asserted that Masumoto teaches establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol, between devices at column 16, line 8 of Masumoto. Column 16, line 8 of Masumoto recites “a wireless LAN may be used …”. From this, the instant Office Action concludes that “as the computer and display device are connected on a wireless network … which would necessary use some protocol.” (Page 6 of instant Office Action). Applicant respectfully disagrees with this conclusion.

As described above, Masumoto teaches no need for establishing a remote session, or for utilizing a remoting protocol. Given that Masumoto is concerned with a single display device, there is not need to establish remote sessions.

Additionally, to conclude that Masumoto “would necessary use some protocol” invokes the doctrine of inherency. To infer that a reference inherently discloses a limitation as claimed, it must be shown that the limitation necessarily flows from the reference. In accordance with MPEP § 2112 Part IV, to meet the burden of establishing the asserted implicit or inherent teachings, the rationale or evidence tending to show inherency must be provided. “The fact that a certain result or characteristic may occur or be present in the prior

art is not sufficient to establish the inherency of that result or characteristic. ... To establish inherency, the extrinsic evidence ‘must make clear that the missing descriptive matter is necessarily present in the thing described in the reference ... The mere fact that a certain thing may result from a given set of circumstances is not sufficient.’ ... ‘In relying upon the theory of inherency, the examiner must provide a basis in fact and/or technical reasoning to reasonably support the determination that the allegedly inherent characteristic necessarily flows from the teachings of the applied art.’” ... (Emphasis in original), MPEP § 2112 Part IV.

Thus, because Masumoto does not necessarily require establishment of a remote session via a remoting protocol, and because there is no indication that Masumoto even contemplates establishing of a remote session via a remoting protocol, it is improper to conclude that Masumoto must necessarily use some protocol.

Because Masumoto teaches only a single display device, and because Masumoto neither discloses nor suggests “establishing a remote session, via a remoting protocol” between devices, it is requested that the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, 10, 13, 16, 17, 19-21, 23-30, and 49-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

#### **Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, and 31-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masumoto in view of various combinations of U.S. Patent No. 6,349,337, issued to Parsons, Jr. *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Parsons”), U.S. Patent No. 6,904,451, issued to Orfitelli *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Orfitelli”), and an article entitled “Software Solution to Completely Wireless Presentation”, authored by Zhang *et al.* (hereinafter referred to as “Zhang”).

Combining Parsons, Orfitelli, and Zhang, in any combination, does not overcome the deficiencies of Masumoto. Accordingly, it is requested that the rejection of claims 3, 7-9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22, and 31-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103, be reconsidered and withdrawn.

**DOCKET NO.:** MSFT-3501/300585.03  
**Application No.:** 10/786,313  
**Office Action Dated:** October 2, 2007

**PATENT**

## **CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing arguments and remarks, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application and an early Notice of Allowance are requested. In the event that Examiner cannot allow this application for any reason, Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned to discuss resolution of any remaining issues.

Date: December 27, 2007

**/Joseph F. Oriti/**  
Joseph F. Oriti  
Registration No. 47,835

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
Cira Centre  
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor  
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439